REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action mailed December 19, 2007 ("Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-21 were pending in the Application. Claims 1-21 stand rejected. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Claim Objections and Section 112 Rejections

Claims 13 and 18 are objected to because of informalities. The Examiner rejects Claims 1-11, 13, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner rejects Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant has made a series of amendments to address the Examiner's concerns.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by "On Inferring Autonomous System Relationships in the Internet", Dec. 2001, IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking, Vol. 9, pg 733-745 by Gao (hereinafter "Gao"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Currently, no reference of record, including *Gao*, offers an architecture in which "...additional two-way connectivity checks are performed through *advertisements in a border gateway protocol* (BGP) such that *unverified states are removed from the directed graph*, and wherein when a third autonomous system sends routing information associated with a third path to the first autonomous system, the third path can be *verified by examining validated connections in the directed graph....*" Such limitations are provided for in Independent Claim 1, but no reference of record includes such elements.

The Examiner cites portions of several references (in his §102 analysis) for some of these features. However, at those passages, there is no disclosure of these items. For at least these reasons, Independent Claim 1 is allowable over any cited reference. The other Independent Claims recite limitations similar, but not identical, to those recited in Independent Claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also allowable, for example, for the same

reasons as identified above. Additionally, the corresponding dependent claims from these Independent Claims are also patentably distinct for analogous reasons.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 6, 11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gao* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0182034 to Klinker et al. (hereinafter "*Klinker*"). Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gao* in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,085,279 to Kumar, et al. (hereinafter "*Kumar*"). Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gao* in view *Kumar* and further in view of *Klinker*. This rejection is moot in light of the §102 analysis provided above.

Thus, all of the pending claims have been shown to be allowable, as they are patentable over the cited references. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested in the form of a full allowance of these claims.

13

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Applicant believes no fee is due. However, if this is not the case, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Thomas J. Frame at 214.953.6675.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant

fromus J. nan

Thomas J. Frame

Reg. No. 47,232

Customer No. 05073

Date: **6 Gruany** 24, 2008